

REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPT
(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT)

TO: NAME OF REVIEWER AND OFFICIAL ADDRESS

FROM: NAME

TITLE

OFFICIAL ADDRESS

RETURN COMPLETED REVIEW TO:

SIGNATURE

DATE

Manuscript Title

Authors

Sponsor

Publication Medium Proposed

The author has submitted this manuscript for review. The author desires publication as indicated above. Would you please serve as an official reviewer? Your frank comments and recommendations on the paper would help us evaluate it with regard to acceptability for publication and would provide suggestions and advice to the author for improving his manuscript. In making the review, you may find the questions in this form helpful. Complete, sign, and return your evaluation, or if you prefer, a letter of evaluation may be substituted for this form. Direct discussion with the author(s) or the sponsor (named above) regarding any suggested changes is encouraged (before this form is completed) especially if you believe that this may lead to a beneficial direct exchange of viewpoints between you and the author. However, if you cannot reach an agreement or if you wish to remain anonymous, please submit written comments in a form suitable for transmission to the author(s).

Please return the manuscript with this form.

We appreciate your cooperation and willingness to serve as an official reviewer of this manuscript.

In keeping with the NOAA policy of completing reviews promptly, can you send us your comments by

_____, 20____? Please notify us immediately if you think it will take longer.

REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPT

1. SCIENTIFIC VALUE OF CONTENT, EITHER AS AN ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD OR AS A PAPER THAT BELONGS IN THE FOLLOWING CLASSIFICATION. (Check on in each column.):

- ☐ Major Significance ☐ Wide Interest
☐ Significant ☐ Interest
☐ Minor Significance ☐ Limited Interest

2. MODE AND CLARITY OF PRESENTATION, INCLUDE LOGICAL ORGANIZATION, CLARITY IN USE OF LANGUAGE, FREEDOM FROM SPECIALIZED SLANG OR JARGON, INCLUSION OF ALL DESIRABLE MATERIAL, OMISSION OF NONESSENTIAL MATERIAL, AND SUFFICIENT EMPHASIS ON MAIN IDEAS. (Check applicable blocks)

- ☐ Outstanding ☐ Very Good ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Minor Defects ☐ Major Defects

(Check "Yes" or "No")

	YES	NO
3. SUITABILITY OF SUBJECT MATTER. The subject matter is appropriate for publication as a contribution from NOAA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. SPECIFIC ASPECTS.		
a. Title is accurate and concise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Abstract is complete, clear, and informative	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. References are adequate, accurate, and include bibliographic data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Figures and captions are all essential and complete.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Tables and captions are all essential and complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other points to be considered:		
(1) The publication of this paper is likely to result in embarrassment to NOAA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) The paper is fanciful, or excessively informal, or unfittingly presented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. CHANGES. (if any)		
a. Have you considered changes necessary in the manuscript as received?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have you discussed the changes with the author?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Has the author agreed and made the suggested changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Are the changes incorporated in the attached manuscript?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(Check applicable block(s))		
6. MEDIUM OF PUBLICATION. Do you consider the proposed medium of publication to be the most appropriate? (If the answer is "NO", suggest an appropriate medium in item 12)	See comments in item 12 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. ORIGINALITY OF SUBJECT MATTER. (If applicable) The essential subject matter is original and has not been treated in prior publications. (If the answer is "NO", suggest an appropriate medium in Item 12).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. ADDITIONAL REVIEW. Would you recommend that any aspects of this paper be subject to additional review? (If the answer is "YES", please specify in item 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPT

	See Comments in item 12	YES	NO
9. LENGTH OF PAPER.			
a. The subject matter is presented concisely and completely	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The length of the paper is in keeping with its relative importance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. TECHNICAL SOUNDNESS.			
Appears to be technically sound and free from mathematical errors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. RELIABILITY. (<i>Considerations that may aid you in assessing reliability: Are the premises and method of approach sound? Are the measurements adequate in scope and number to support the conclusions? Were the measuring instruments properly calibrated? Are the conclusions set forth clearly and accurately and are they supported by convincing evidence? Are the results reproducible as to both method and data? Is any additional work, data, or tests needed?</i>)			
a. Is the paper free from errors in logic, inference, and analysis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Are you satisfied as to the reliability of the data or conclusions presented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Are the uncertainties of reported numerical values clearly and correctly stated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ON ITEMS 1-11 (Specific comments on manuscript, and suggestions for author's improvement of manuscript or for further study of the subject.) (Page 4 may be used for additional space.)			
13. OVERALL EVALUATION. (Summarize in one paragraph your considered opinion of this paper, indicating clearly why you feel it is or is not ready for publication as recommended in Item 14.)			
14. RECOMMENDATION. Check box indicating whether you recommend:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Publication of this manuscript in present form or with minor revisions, either <input type="checkbox"/> In Medium proposed. <input type="checkbox"/> In some other form or medium.			
<input type="checkbox"/> Publication only after major revisions and additional view.			
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection.			
15. DO YOU WISH TO REMAIN ANONYMOUS? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			
16. SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER		17. DATE	
_____		_____	

REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPT

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR SUGGESTION